

June 28, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8263

And the President obviously was reluctant to display public enthusiasm for a hasty high-level conference that would promise much and produce little of diplomatic substance.

The arrangements finally worked out for the session by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko appear to have satisfied the wishes of their two leaders.

In our view, the most that should be hoped for at the LBJ-ANK summit is that the President and the premier will get to know each other on friendly terms.

If that occurs, the meeting will have served its purpose, for it could well smooth the way for a full-fledged summit at an appropriate time in the future that could come to grips with urgent international issues.

### U.S. FOREIGN AID LOANS ARE BEING REPAID

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. KORNIGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will be interested to know that U.S. foreign aid loans are being repaid. More than one-fifth of the value of funds disbursed in economic aid loans has already come back in principal and interest payments.

From 1948 until March 31, 1967, disbursement of these foreign aid loans totaled \$13.2 billion. Countries on the receiving end have repaid nearly \$2.9 billion in principal and interest.

The total includes repayments on both dollar loans made by the U.S. Agency for International Development and its predecessor agencies and loans made in local currencies derived from food for freedom transactions.

This total does not reflect collections by the Export-Import Bank or other overseas loan programs not administered by AID or its predecessors.

The \$2.9 billion reflow includes more than \$1.5 billion collected in U.S. dollars—two-thirds of it since July 1, 1961. The equivalent of \$1.35 billion was repaid in foreign currencies.

The disbursement figure of \$13.2 billion, including \$4.3 billion equivalent in foreign currencies, is about \$3 billion less than the total of AID-administered loan agreements. The difference represents funds committed which have not actually been paid out.

Of the total disbursed, \$6.7 billion—more than half—must be repaid in U.S. dollars. Since enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which established the current AID program, all development loans must be repaid in dollars.

The dollar collections to date include \$878 million in principal repayments and \$657 million in interest. Payments received in foreign currencies include the equivalent of \$465 million on principal and the equivalent of \$882 million in interest.

AID has placed increased emphasis on loans, with lending rather than grants accounting for half of all AID program obligations in U.S. dollars during recent years.

These loan funds are limited largely to procurement of goods and services

from the United States. Eighty-seven percent of all AID program expenditures during the first half of fiscal year 1967 remained in the United States. For commodities alone, U.S. procurement was approximately 95 percent.

This loan activity is illustrated in two tables from the Agency for International Development, and under unanimous consent I include them in the Record at this point:

#### Repayments of AID-administered loans—1948-March 31, 1967

[In millions of dollars, or equivalent]

##### I. Receipts in dollars

A. The AID Period, FY 1962—FY 1967/nine months

Repayments on principal	\$721.7
Interest payments	300.5
Subtotal	1,022.2

##### B. FY 1949-FY 1961

Repayments on principal	156.5
Interest payments	356.4
Subtotal	512.9

Total dollar payments

1,535.1

##### II. Receipts in foreign currencies, entire period

Repayments on principal	465.0
Interest payments	882.4

Subtotal—all foreign currency payments

1,347.4

Total, all payments

2,882.5

<sup>1</sup> Includes principal, \$878.2 million; interest, \$656.9 million.

<sup>2</sup> Recapitulation; all currencies: principal, \$1,343.2 million; interest, \$1,539.3 million.

NOTE: Above data pertains only to loans authorized by AID and predecessor agencies; it does not include Export-Import Bank, military assistance or other U.S. loans overseas not administered by AID and predecessors.

#### Summary of AID-administered lending—April 3, 1948-March 31, 1967

[In billions of dollars, or equivalent]

	Loan commitments	Loan disbursements
Aid (fiscal year 1962-67)	\$6.6	\$4.4
Public Law 480 loans	5.0	4.3
Predecessor agencies and other	4.7	4.5
Total	16.3	13.2

### INEQUITY IN RETIRED PAY

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. KORNIGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I was privileged to be invited to dinner meeting of the San Antonio Retired Officers Association. The city of San Antonio is proud to have been chosen as the retirement home of so many officers of the armed services. We benefit immensely from the energy, the experience, and the public spirit of our retired officers and their local association.

My visit again impressed me with the inequity in retired pay afforded by this Nation, through Congress, to those officers who served her long and with dedi-

cation. Traditionally, pay increases for retired officers correspond to increases in active duty pay. But this system was suspended in 1958. At that time I was a member of the Texas State Senate and I sponsored a resolution which passed unanimously in 1959 memorializing Congress and deploring the change in retired pay computation. However, the traditional system was abandoned fully in 1963 for cost-of-living increases. This new system has resulted in seven different rates of retired pay so far to officers with identical ranks and years of service, simply because they retired at different times. Admitting a minor inequity has recently developed in the present system—an unintentional inequity—the Department of Defense has proposed an involved system of pegging the retired pay rate at a proportion of the active duty pay being drawn at retirement time plus as small as one-tenth of one percent of any monthly increase in the Consumer Price Index. The system itself seems to be getting more and more ludicrous, while officers who retired before July 1958 get less and less than their colleagues with identical rank and years of service who have been retiring since that date.

I do not believe there is any doubt that we have betrayed a trust to our retired officers. The officer retiring now served in the Armed Forces at pay inferior to civilian jobs partly in anticipation of good retired pay, at a time when retirement programs in private industry were generally nonexistent and when social security benefits were small. Now that retired pay no longer corresponds to active duty pay, the retirement situation has been reversed and our retired officers have lost out at both ends. This is doubly reprehensible at a time when the principle of pay comparability with private industry has been accepted for civil service employees.

Mr. Speaker, I have been moved to join several of my House colleagues in sponsoring recomputation legislation. I am introducing today a bill, designated as H.R. 11240, the proposed Uniformed Services Retirement Pay Equalization Act.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. KORNIGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. KORNIGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. KORNIGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

H 8264

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 28, 1967

## THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: A SITUATION REPORT

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. KORNAGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 the people of the Dominican Republic will celebrate the completion of the first year of the government of President Joaquin Balaguer. I was privileged to be a member of the U.S. delegation at his inauguration. This first year is of special significance in that Dr. Balaguer is the first freely elected President to celebrate an anniversary of government.

Some months ago I returned to our neighboring country on a visit, where I talked to a good many people both in a private and an official capacity. I would like to pass on to my colleagues some observations on the current situation in this important Caribbean nation.

President Balaguer tends to look upon his administration as a transition from the disorder of the immediate post-Trujillo years to a stable and modern democratic system of government. Success in holding the country together means the Dominican Republic can now begin to make significant economic and social progress. I look forward to the Balaguer government being a strong base for further development in the 1970's in the development of individual liberty, constitutional government and economic progress which the Dominican people have been denied for so many years.

To comprehend the full measure of this task it is best to recall the crisis situation that existed when Dr. Balaguer took office in July of 1966. The nation was deeply rent by personal, ideological and political differences left over from the civil conflict of 1965 and the political upheavals of the preceding years. The free elections of 1966 brought both hope and fear—hope for a lasting democracy and fear of what might happen when the Inter-American Peace Force left the country. There were at the time few optimists about the long-term prospects of the new administration.

Rumors of new "golpes"—by the Communists, by the military, by the left, by the right—kept circulating. Many experts predicted that the government of President Balaguer could maintain itself in power only by reverting to authoritarian methods. Some made the forecast that the government would end up in the hands of the Trujillistas. But the basis of these rumors—if indeed any ever existed—have faded away in the last year.

Nine months after the withdrawal of the IAPF, President Balaguer remains in office. Furthermore, he has maintained political stability and avoided authoritarian measures. He has achieved a measure of reconciliation within the structure of the Dominican society and he has attempted to establish a reasonable relationship with the elements of both the left and right which oppose the government.

Admittedly all of his efforts have not met with success, and mutual suspicions remain to impede complete accord. But

the earlier pessimists now admit that Dr. Balaguer has a reasonable chance to fulfill his mission to set the Dominican Republic firmly on the path toward democratic development. The success so far at least gives promise for a brighter future for the Dominican people.

On the economic front, President Balaguer inherited an economic situation spawned by 30 years of dictatorship and aggravated by the chaos of 1965. One year is a very short time to remedy the economic ills and chart a course of economic growth; to do so in the Dominican Republic, deprived by its history of trained and experienced administrators is a herculean task. It would be foolish to believe that more than a small beginning could be made in 1 year, and President Balaguer, himself, emphasized this all-too-evident fact in declaring 1967 a "year of development."

But a start has been made. President Balaguer, with our assistance, has mounted a substantial program to stimulate the country's economic recovery. Progress has been made in the construction of housing and public works. In four projects now well underway over 400 low-cost houses have already been completed. In public works, a complete storm sewer system was installed in Santiago de los Caballeros, over 20 miles of new water pipe has been added to the water supply system in the capital, more than 365 rural school rooms have been constructed or repaired, over 17,000 acres of agriculture land have been reclaimed by the rehabilitation of the irrigation system, to mention but a few of the many projects of this nature. Unemployment continues to run high, but more than 20,000 people have found work in these programs.

The community development program—OCD—connected directly with the President's office, has expanded its activities and more than 160 Dominican development promoters are living and working in the villages and countryside assisting the rural communities to organize and help themselves with every sort of community service, schools, sanitary installations, wells, small industry shops, and lots of others. This program is now perhaps the most promising of its kind anywhere in the hemisphere.

The Dominican Republic is a farming country and agriculture is at the head of President Balaguer's investment program and of U.S. assistance. Investment and farm credit programs supported by massive technical assistance—mostly from Texas A. & M.—are concentrating on peanuts, corn, beans, and sorgham. This should soon—in a year or so—make a big dent in the Dominican Republic's \$50 million yearly bill for food imports. In addition new production in winter fruits and vegetables, although substantially less than expected, resulted in over 80,000 crates of cantaloups; 27,000 bushels of cucumbers by the first of April, the beginning of the season; and a promising crop of tomatoes and other vegetables. These are export commodities for the U.S. market and with the start made this year we can expect that winter fruits and vegetables will prove to be a major source of foreign exchange earnings within the next 2 years.

President Balaguer has endeavored to attract major private investment, both foreign and domestic, and these major ventures have begun to meet with success. To assist this effort, a private investment fund has been established with a \$5 million loan from the United States and a matching \$5 million loan from the Inter-American Development Bank. In addition, the Dominican Industrial Development Corp., has been reorganized basically along the lines of the existing and successfully functioning prototype in Puerto Rico. Hopefully, the DIDC can now serve as a catalyst to spur industrial development and private investment.

The Dominican Government has made a determined attempt to reduce costs in the state-owned sugar operations. The costs of production are now slightly over 5 cents per pound as compared to over 7 cents in January 1966. Of course, these costs are nowhere near the costs during the Trujillo period, but then neither is slave labor being used to process the sugar. The Dominican Government has contracted with private American consultants to develop measures to make these operations more efficient and to possibly divert some of the sugar lands to other production.

In the field of education, the Dominican Government is, for the first time, taking positive and effective steps to provide the citizens with modern education using modern facilities employing modern methods. The OCD, which I mentioned before, is bringing agricultural education to the backwoods campesinos, and American Peace Corps instructors are busily preparing Dominican teachers to return to the backward parts of the country in the hope of revolutionizing the primary school system.

In higher education, the new Madre Maestra University in Santiago was built by funds partly supplied by a group of Dominican businessmen. Another politics-free university was split off from the University of Santo Domingo after the April 1965 revolt. The impact of increased college-trained citizens will soon be felt in the Dominican Republic.

Soon after his election, President Balaguer launched an austerity program aimed at correcting the balance of payments and fiscal problems which have plagued the Dominican Republic since its birth. In spite of early predictions and expectations, imports continued to exceed exports and slowly drained the country's exchange reserves. Revenue inflow has not yet reached the levels previously hoped for. President Balaguer is faced with a race between deteriorating fiscal and foreign exchange position of his country and his programs to increase revenues, restrict imports and stimulate exports. It is in this area that he is confronted with his most serious problems. Although the outcome is by no means certain, Dr. Balaguer has a reasonably good chance to bring the country through this critical period, provided that the basic economic potential of the Dominican Republic is combined with the determination of the Government and support from the other South and North American nations. If this occurs, the prospects for economic development and political stability are better than the

June 28, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8265

most optimistic observer might have hoped 2 years ago. The Dominican Republic has indeed come a long way since the critical days of April 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that our confidence in the Government of the Dominican Republic and its people has been justified by the results.

But, Mr. Speaker, the crucial battle for political independence and individual freedom has rested and will always rest with the people. Without a fierce determination to resist subversion of these rights by the people, governmental efforts—both internal and external—are doomed to failure. The Dominican people under President Balaguer's leadership have shown during the last year that they have the determination and will to exist and compete in the world community as a free nation. I salute the Dominican Republic on this joyous occasion.

## MAINE POWERPLANT IN QUESTION

(Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I understand that sometime later in this session we will be asked to approve an additional appropriation of \$1,600,000 for final engineering of the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School Federal hydroelectric project in Maine. It is my intention to oppose this request as I have done for the past 2 years and as a majority of this House has done on at least two occasions.

In my opinion, the recently filed Appropriations Committee staff report on his project, while I believe it was a genuine and sincere effort, has left as many unanswered as answered questions, and falls short of the mark. In the coming weeks, with your permission, I shall point out a number of the unresolved problems of this project including the incomplete nature of treaty negotiations with Canada, the lack of marketing plans for the power output, the underestimated and incomplete construction estimates of the Interior Department, and the Corps of Engineers, and the basic obsolescence of the project which now cannot be completed until the mid-1970's.

In this regard today I would like to submit for the benefit of all the Members the Associated Press story on this staff report as it appeared in the Providence Journal of June 8:

## MAINE POWER PLAN IN QUESTION

WASHINGTON.—A staff report by a House subcommittee has cast doubt on what benefits consumers would derive from the Dickey-Lincoln public power and flood control project in Maine.

A study by the public works subcommittee of the House appropriations committee said the hydroelectric power produced at Dickey-Lincoln would amount to less than two per cent of the energy required in New England for 1975 and that price savings would be widely dispersed and would have little effect on the individual consumer.

The staff report was made in connection with committee hearings on a request by the Army Engineers for 1.7 million dollars to complete preliminary planning for the project in the fiscal year starting July 1.

The project, on the upper St. John River, would involve a reservoir and dam near Dickey, Maine, and a smaller dam and reservoir 11 miles downstream.

The engineers have revised estimated construction costs downward from 218.6 million dollars to 212 million. Congress authorized the project in 1965.

The report said government officials have stated that other types of plants, particularly nuclear, could produce power for New England more cheaply than the Dickey-Lincoln project.

The subcommittee asked Kenneth Holum, assistant secretary of the interior, about this. He replied, according to printed testimony: "I think it is appropriate to look at Dickey-Lincoln as a multi-resource development project and to take credit for the other benefits it provides—flood control, or area redevelopment, and what we recover from our good neighbors in Canada as a result of the downstream benefits created for them."

The report noted the opposition of private power interests to the government project and said: "Neither the representatives of Interior nor those of the private utility companies have ever consulted with each other for the particular purpose of coordinating their efforts and integrating their planning to accomplish the aims they share in common."

Mr. Holum told the subcommittee the situation is not quite as bad as the staff report indicates and that the Interior Department will consult with the privately owned power companies at an appropriate time.

## TELEVISION X-RADIATION

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last week, the television receiver X-radiation problem is of growing serious concern to myself and numerous of my colleagues. In order to provide further information on this subject I submit a letter received from the Federal Communications Commission:

This letter will confirm the information given to you by Mr. Herman Garlan, one of our staff engineers, during a telephone conversation on June 6, 1967.

Radiation is a generic term which means the emission of energy in the form of electromagnetic waves. These include, in order of increasing frequency or decreasing wavelength, radio waves, heat rays, infra-red radiation, visible light, ultra-violet radiation, X-rays, gamma rays, cosmic rays. The Commission uses the term radiation in the restricted sense of emission of radio waves. Thus a transmitter radiates, i.e., emits electromagnetic energy (radio waves) for the purpose of communicating by radio. On the other hand, a TV receiver radiates, i.e., emits electromagnetic energy (radio waves) that is capable of causing harmful interference to, or disrupting, radio communication. In the mind of the public, unfortunately, the term radiation has come to mean the dangerous emissions—X-rays and rays given off during nuclear disintegration (atomic radiation).

The generation of X-rays in a television receiver is a fact of life—an undesirable side effect associated with its normal operation. X-rays may be generated whenever an electron moving at high speed (under acceleration from a sufficiently high voltage) strikes a material substance. X-rays are a form of electromagnetic energy and differ from light and radio waves only in frequency. Thus, X-rays have frequencies of approximately  $10^{18}$  cycles/second, or higher, about six orders

of magnitude above the upper end of the radio spectrum used for communications which is 3000 Gigacycles/second— $3 \times 10^{12}$  c/s.

In the TV receiver there are two significant places where X-rays may be generated: In the high voltage rectifier tube and in the picture tube. These are the places where the highest voltages will be found. X-rays generated at other points will be overshadowed by those produced in the high voltage rectifier and the picture tube. Furthermore, the protective measures taken will also safeguard against these other sources.

The quantity or intensity of the X-radiation is related to the voltage available to accelerate the electrons. Accordingly, color sets which use significantly higher voltages, will yield more X-rays than black-and-white sets. Similarly, 25" TV receivers may be expected to generate more X-rays than small portable receivers.

The metal shield around the high voltage rectifier to protect against shock hazard also serves to confine the X-radiation, since the X-rays generated in a TV set have relatively little penetrating power through metal. The picture tube face plate is protected by a sheet of leaded safety glass which absorbs a large part of the X-radiation generated. That level of X-radiation that passes through this safety glass is below the permitted level and is rapidly dissipated in the air surrounding the receiver. The level of X-rays at about 6" from the face plate of the picture tube is for all practical purposes negligible.

The manufacturers of TV receivers have been aware of this problem from the very start and have taken appropriate measures mentioned above to keep the X-radiation within acceptable limits. Moreover, as part of their testing program, the Underwriters Laboratories (UL) have been testing television receivers for X-radiation as well as for electric shock hazard and other safety features. The standard used by UL specifies that the X-radiation shall not exceed 2.5 millirentgens per hour (mr/hr). It is understood that the UL is considering changing this standard to bring it into conformance with the current recommendation of the International Commission on Radiation Protection that the maximum level of X-radiation shall not exceed 0.5 mr/hr. This revised standard is expected to go into effect within the next year or two.

The Commission now exercises control over the electromagnetic energy (in the form of radio waves) that is emitted by the TV receiver. This control is designed to insure that such radiation or emission of electromagnetic energy will not cause harmful interference to radio communication. Our regulations promulgated to achieve this control provide for the measurement by the manufacturer of the interference-causing radiation and certification to the Commission. The receiver is then labeled, for the information of the public, as complying with the regulations in Part 15 of our Rules. The details of this label—size, wording, etc., are not specified in the Commission's regulations. We are enclosing for your information a copy of a public notice which discusses this non-interference label or seal.

In the case of the interference-causing radiation, the Commission has a great deal of expert knowledge both as to the level of signals to be protected and the levels of interfering emanations that can be tolerated. One the other hand, in the case of X-rays, the Commission does not have the expert knowledge necessary to assess the effects of X-radiation on humans or to determine the level of X-radiation that can be tolerated. It would appear that the control of X-radiation from TV receivers should more properly fall within the jurisdiction of an agency which can be expected to have expert knowledge in this field, such as the Public Health Service or some other sub-

H 8266

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 28, 1967

division of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Attention is also called to the existence of the Federal Radiation Council formed in 1959 (Public Law 86-373) to provide a Federal policy on human radiation exposure. While this council has concerned itself primarily with atomic radiation and its effect, the mandate under which the Council operates is sufficiently broad to encompass X-radiation.

Very truly yours,

BEN F. WAPLE,  
Secretary.

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOSS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

### FUTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(Mr. BROWN of California (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson flew to California last Friday night, June 23, to speak at a \$1,000-per-couple fundraising dinner sponsored by the President's Club. Because I am a loyal Democrat and deeply concerned about the welfare of the Democratic Party, I hope that the President's appearance contributed to a great financial success. However, a nationally syndicated columnist reported today—June 28—that a substantial part of those attending the affair had made their contribution to the President's Club as long as 2 years ago—on the occasion of a similar dinner which had to be canceled—and that the amount of new money raised was considerably less than might have been expected.

Regardless of the financial aspect of this affair, it presented other features which should deeply disturb every Democrat concerned about the party's prospects for 1968. I will mention some of these because they deserve to be considered by every Member of Congress, as well as by all Democrats, as an indication of the mood of the people on the issue of Vietnam.

On the day of the President's visit, 8,000 Democrats in southern California bought three full pages in the Los Angeles Times to send an open letter to the President. This represents the largest single effort to convey the message of dissent on Vietnam via a newspaper ad that has yet occurred in this country to my knowledge. Thousands of names are still pouring in of persons who wish to be identified with the open letter but were received too late to be included in the ad. Recognizing the limitations on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I will not list here the names included in the ad, but I will include at this point the text of the open letter:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

This is to respectfully advise you, Mr. President, that as of this date we 8000

registered Democrats of Southern California, who helped elect you in 1964, are disassociating ourselves from you and your administration because of your conduct of the war in Vietnam.

We voted for you because you gave us hope of peace when in your election campaign you said: "We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves." (Akron, Ohio, October 21, 1964) This was a pledge, Mr. President. Since then over 10,000 Americans and countless Vietnamese have been killed in this war.

Your administration threatens us daily with the prospect of an all-out confrontation with China and inevitably with the Soviet Union, leading us inexorably toward a thermonuclear holocaust.

Mr. President, we dissenting Democrats want a cessation bombing and an end to escalation. We want an immediate beginning of meaningful negotiations with all forces involved in this conflict. We want out of the war in Vietnam!

We echo the observation of Democratic Senator George McGovern who said: "We seem bent on saving the Vietnamese people, even if we have to kill them and demolish their country to do so. I do not intend to remain silent in the face of a policy of madness."

We will also, no longer commit the crime of silence. We endorse the statement of Republican Senator Mark Hatfield, who said of this war: "The freedom to stand opposed to the government's policy is not a privilege that can be withdrawn when the boat begins to rock. That freedom is the inherent right of a people in a democracy."

We have taken pride in the domestic accomplishments of the Democratic Party. But today, our concern for our country and for humanity outweighs any rigid party affiliations.

Mr. President, we advise you and those on every level of government that, from this day on, our campaign funds, our energies and our votes go to those and only those political figures who work for an end to the war in Vietnam.

DISSENTING DEMOCRATS,  
ROBERT VAUGHN,

Chairman.

I have learned just today that, because of the unexpectedly large response of the public to this open letter of dissent, a permanent organization is being established to continue working toward the goal of changing U.S. policy in Vietnam. This organization will make its primary appeal to the ordinary citizen—who has reservations about participating in marches, demonstrations, picketlines, and some of the more visible and vocal manifestations of dissent which have become so common. I believe that their impact on the political prospects of the Democratic Party may be as great or greater than the physical demonstrations which are also taking place, however. Lest it be inferred that this open letter was a substitute for more direct action at the President's Ball last Friday, I would like to briefly refer to the other events. The Los Angeles Times for Saturday, June 24, carried the following front page eight-column headlines: "10,000 in Mele—War Protest Mars L. B. J. Visit."

Other stories reported as many as 20,000 persons participating in an all-day protest which included a rally, speeches, and a march on the hotel at which the President appeared. I include at this point a brief description of the events:

### POLICE CLASH WITH CROWD OUTSIDE HOTEL (By Paul Houston)

President Johnson dined with admiring Democrats at \$1,000-a-couple fund-raising festivities here Friday night—out of sight of a clash between 1,300 club-swinging police and 10,000 antiwar demonstrators outside the Century Plaza Hotel where he spoke.

Police made a total of 45 arrests—during an earlier incident and as they cleared the huge throng from the hotel entrance with a massive show of force.

More than two dozen persons were observed to have been bloodied by riot sticks as police made a sweep of the area within an hour after the President's arrival.

Police said they themselves were stoned, spat upon and had their badges torn off.

### MAY HAVE SEEN MARCH

The major confrontation occurred shortly after Mr. Johnson and his daughter, Lynda Bird, jetted to International Airport from the East and took a helicopter to the hotel.

It was possible they observed from the air the 10,000 chanting, sign-carrying demonstrators marching up the Avenue of the Stars from Cheviot Hills Playground nearby.

At 11:55 p.m., four hours and 15 minutes after arriving in Los Angeles, the presidential party left by jet for the Johnson ranch in Texas.

Shortly after the presidential party entered the hotel from the rear under heavy guard, the demonstrators began piling up in front of the hotel.

In 30 minutes concerned police shouting through bullhorns declared the crowd to be an unlawful assembly and ordered it to disperse.

In another half hour, around 9 p.m., 1,000 helmeted police began moving on the crowd in lines two-deep, jabbing and beating some unruly demonstrators with riot sticks.

Within 15 minutes the crowd had been pushed to the far east side of the four-lane Avenue of the Stars into a vacant lot. Soon the crowd was moving north and south to Constellation and Olympic Bldgs.

Assisting in the sweep movement were several hundred reserves called in from nearby stations. Also rushed to the area were more than 100 officers from other parts of the city as part of a Tactical Alert call.

One group of demonstrators moved to Olympic Blvd. and began dancing in the street near the Avenue of the Stars overpass.

When police motorcycle officers and patrol cars attempted to disperse them, one man sat down in front of a car. Others joined him. Police soon broke up the sit-in.

Other protesters at the hotel, however, left the area and did not return.

It is obvious from these reports that, while the President's Ball may not have set a record in the usual political sense, it set at least two new records for dissent. More people bought more paid advertising space to protest the Vietnam policy of the administration than on any previous occasion, and the Los Angeles Police were engaged in the largest single crowd-control operation in their experience with politically dissenting people.

I do not particularly relish having these kinds of records set in Los Angeles. I hope with all my heart that the reasons for such actions will soon disappear.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]



June 28, 1967

**PROPOSED MERGER BETWEEN COLUMBIA BROADCASTING CORP. AND PUBLISHERS HOLT, RINEHART & WINSTON**

(Mr. MONTGOMERY (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned over the proposed merger between Columbia Broadcasting Corp. and the publishing firm of Holt, Rinehart & Winston. This merger is expected to occur on June 29, after a referendum in which shareholders of both companies are to participate.

The reason for my strong disapproval of such a merger is not related to the private economic advantages or disadvantages that may occur, but it is one of greater importance the public interest.

Both of these companies are responsible for absorbing vast amounts of information that they in turn digest and present to the American public. In my mind, I feel that two companies that influence such a large portion of our citizens should not be merged into a single monopolistic concern. Freedom of competition has been one of our most precious principles in the field of economics, and I believe that the people of this country want this competitive freedom to continue in the fields of expression.

I am not saying that this proposed merger will result in injury to the public, but I do feel that the potential dangers of such a merger are obvious and must be fully realized. This criticism is not aimed at either corporation individually or the policies of either corporation, but it is aimed at the possible combination of television and textbook publishing trades in such a manner that our citizens will be unduly subjected to the same chains of thought throughout their school and adult years with little choice of selection.

I urge that the shareholders of Columbia Broadcasting Corp. and the publishing firm of Holt, Rinehart & Winston look not at their own private interests but look to the interests of the American people.

**POZNAN UPRISINGS IN 1956**

(Mr. HOWARD (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the Poznan disturbances among factory workers were the upshot of the discontent and dissatisfaction on the part of underpaid and overworked employees in the large factory there. It was also the first open manifestation of justified complaints on the part of Polish workers in this highly industrialized city. Apparently it was not meant to be a political uprising or politically directed against the Polish Communist government, though it actually had political implications and wide repercussions throughout Poland.

All workers in Poland had felt that they were exploited by their Communist factory managers and foremen, and were not paid fair wages for their work. They

had been working long hours under bad conditions, without proper sanitary and safety provisions. For years they endured such hardship, knowing that their complaints and protests would not result in any improvement in their lot. But by mid-1956 the workers became somewhat vocal, and on June 28, during the Poznan Fair, they staged a demonstration, without realizing that it was to take the appearance of an armed revolt. For a day or two fighting raged between the Polish troops and the workers, and finally it was quieted with the aid of Soviet troops.

Soon both the Polish and Soviet authorities realized the seriousness of their precipitate action, causing the death of scores of workers. Instead of trying to gain the good will of the workers, they were thus antagonizing them. Immediately after the uprisings the authorities proved lenient and quite conciliatory, and in the end the government seemed to have learned a lesson.

The upshot was that the rigidity of control over the economy of the country was relaxed; de-Stalinization proceeded faster in Poland than in the Soviet Union, and the government was most willing to come to terms with workers on questions of pay raise, short working hours under better working conditions, and participation of workers in the management of factories. All these positive gains on the part of the workers were the result of the Poznan uprisings of June 1956. That is the significance of that event, and that is why its anniversary is being celebrated by all patriotic Poles and their friends everywhere.

**NEW JERSEY PROUD TO HOST MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND PREMIER KOSYGIN**

(Mr. HOWARD (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that my State was host at Hollybush—this first meeting between our President and Premier Kosygin. We are part of a new page in history. Our south New Jersey town was spread across the front pages of the Nation and the world. More important, Glassboro was the place where there was made a careful, cautious, conditional step toward peace. This meeting was part of what the Russians call peaceful coexistence, and what we call peaceful, constructive engagement.

You may think it is only local pride that makes me talk of New Jersey's role in the Hollybush summit, but I feel our Governor wisely chose Glassboro—and thereby made it possible for Premier Kosygin to see a beautiful corner of smalltown America.

All of us in New Jersey share a pride in the contribution our citizens made to this historic meeting. We expressed the affection and respect which Americans feel for our own President. We demonstrated our good will for the Russian people, and our hope that we can live in peace together—in mutual respect and genuine good will. I know that Premier Kosygin took home the knowledge that

we wish his country well and that we want both friendship and peace.

This was our President's message and our people's message. The townspeople and students of Glassboro spoke for America.

Our President has told us that his face-to-face discussions with Premier Kosygin did much to reduce misunderstanding. Even with their disagreements they found elements, beginnings, hopeful fractions of common ground. They made this world a little less dangerous for us all.

Perhaps the most hopeful area they found for progress is in disarmament. There is a real prospect that we can work out a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

We have had our discouragements. Too often it seems that disarmament is like a party. Nobody wants to arrive until everybody else is there.

But the summit at Hollybush did open the door to further progress. In the days to come, Secretary Rusk and Foreign Minister Gromyko will be talking in New York to make this opportunity a reality. So the hopes of the world go with these statesmen as they search for final agreement.

It is a better and a safer world today than it was 5 days ago. Disagreements persist. The tragedy of the Vietnam conflict continues. While we can be profoundly grateful that fighting in the Holy Land has ended, the Arabs and the Jews have not yet found peace. Nevertheless, the world is grateful that our President met and talked with Premier Kosygin—for 10 long hours. Each learned the measure of the other man. Each better understood the other's policies—and the other's problems. We all are a little closer to a secure and peaceful world.

The meeting at Hollybush was one of the most demanding and important of the many efforts undertaken by our President in his continuing search for peace in the world. Our country's positions were persuasively stated with clarity, dignity, and firmness. I believe that all Americans will agree that our President met the test of this great hour in an incomparable manner.

**HISTORIC SUMMIT MEETING AT GLASSBORO**

(Mr. HOWARD (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as a Jerseyite, the past few days have been filled with pride for me as I am sure they have for the other 7 million citizens of a noble State. For New Jersey, already so rich in history, another chapter was written with the historic summit meeting at Glassboro State College. Now, people the world over pray that the "spirit of Glassboro," born out of the universal hope of peace for all men, can take on further meaning and force through the process of international deliberation and accomplishment. This, however, is for the future to decide.

June 28, 1967

We Jerseyites feel an even broader pride. For it was our Governor, Richard J. Hughes, a leader of sensitivity and proportion, who conceived the Glassboro meeting as a solution to the seeming impasse over diplomatic protocol. Knowing the President's intense desire to explore new avenues to peace, Governor Hughes proposed a New Jersey meeting to the President and suggested the State college at Glassboro as an ideal site midway between New York and Washington. Then, on acceptance of the idea, it was Governor Hughes who speedily rallied the State police and other public agencies in the Garden State to successfully solve the thousand and one problems of detail essential to a meeting of such significance.

The fact that Governor Hughes and his colleagues in New Jersey were able to complete this massive job in less than 24 hours is an indication, on an international level, of what we in New Jersey have always known about the effectiveness of this outstanding Governor.

Contributing importantly to the occasion were the people of the Glassboro area in south Jersey. More than the words of statesmen, the warm and friendly reception they accorded the leaders of the world's two most powerful nations bespoke the universal yearning of men for peace.

I am honored to be able to place these facts in the RECORD. I hope these small actions by the Governor and the people of my State will stand as contributions to what history will come to know as the theme of a peaceful world, the "spirit of Glassboro."

*Office*  
**THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC MOVES TOWARD A DEMOCRATIC FUTURE AND A BETTER LIFE FOR ALL ITS PEOPLE**

(Mr. IRWIN (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, just over a year ago, I was privileged to watch as the Dominican Republic—a nation of 3 million—made a vast stride forward in its 5-year battle for stability and progress.

As one of 43 official observers for the Organization of American States, I was there as the Dominican Republic chose a new President, a congress and municipal officers. It was a proud day because the elections, beyond doubt, were, freely conducted.

It is too early to say that the Dominican Republic, our close neighbor in the Caribbean, has shaken free of the bitterness and internal divisions which have marked its history over the last 6 years.

But it is not too early to take note that this country has made surprising progress toward a reconciliation of its differences and shows hopeful signs that it may end the unfortunate cycle of dictatorship and chaos which has been its historical lot.

We salute the Dominican Republic on the eve of July 1, for on July 1 the freely elected constitutional government

of President Joaquin Balaguer will complete its first year in office. The chances appear reasonably good that President Balaguer will complete his 4-year term.

The great majority of the Dominican people have given clear evidence of their desire to support the constitutional system and to look toward elections as the means of resolving their political differences. It is a hopeful sign, Mr. President, that political speculation in the Dominican Republic is now focusing on the municipal elections next summer and the presidential election in 1970 rather than on rumors of attempts to overthrow the constitutional government.

If these elections can be held in the free and fair manner of the elections of June 1, 1966, and their results accepted, the Dominicans will have made a great stride in the institutionalization of democratic traditions. The way is now open for this step, and President Balaguer, the responsible opposition and the Dominican people are entitled to be proud of the progress which has been made.

While recognizing the primary importance of political development, President Balaguer has not ignored the pressing need for rapid economic and social development in his country. With our substantial assistance he has begun an ambitious program to diversify the economy, primarily by developing its agricultural resources and encouraging private investment.

This new effort, however, has been impeded by the country's weak fiscal position and balance of payments difficulties. President Balaguer has applied austerity measures to these difficulties. Our programs in the Dominican Republic are designed to encourage increased production of export commodities and import substitutes. In this way we are helping in the attempt to correct the basic disequilibrium of the Dominican economy which causes its present financial difficulties.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Dominican Republic is moving toward a democratic future and a better life for all its people.

**OEO'S FUTURE AT STAKE**

(Mr. TIERNAN (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been doing an excellent job in waging one of the most difficult battles our Nation has ever undertaken—the war on poverty.

Since OEO is the essential command post in this vital struggle, it is of prime importance that the agency be maintained and strengthened. Those who favor the breakup of OEO are extremely shortsighted because the arguments in favor of continuation are excellent. In that regard, I insert in the RECORD a particularly good editorial entitled "OEO's Future at Stake" which appeared in the June 14 edition of the Providence Journal:

**OEO'S FUTURE AT STAKE**

The governor of Iowa, the mayors of six large cities, and seven nonpartisan city managers have joined in an appeal to Congress

and the administration not to dismember the antipoverty program by reassigning projects administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity to old-line agencies.

The appeal counters a campaign spearheaded by some Republicans to dismantle OEO and portion out its functions. It is certain to be a central issue at this week's antipoverty hearings in Washington. How the matter is resolved will be a major determining factor in the future of this program.

Depending on the effectiveness of individual programs in the poverty war, administrative unity in time may lose its importance. The time may come, for example, when the Department of Health, Education and Welfare might more effectively assume total responsibility for the educational programs, when the Department of Labor might best be given control of all work training programs.

To preserve the innovative qualities of the antipoverty war, so important in bringing about social change, unity of command, is virtually essential. Under a director who is dedicated to the principles on which the Economy Opportunity Act is based, momentum is more likely to be maintained. Sargent Shriver's record is not perfect, but it is good. His experience in the office has grown, and his ability to handle the subtleties of controversy has developed steadily.

The time may come when through trial and error, the ways of effectively fighting poverty and its crippling side effects will become more clearly defined than now is the case. Until it does, the singleness of purpose manifested by OEO is a weapon that the nation should not have to do without.

**CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON INTRODUCES ANTIRIOT LEGISLATION**

(Mr. HAMILTON (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, last session, like a substantial number of my colleagues, I voted for the antiriot amendment to the House passed Civil Rights Act of 1966. When it became clear during that session that this act was not going to pass the Senate, I joined a number of my colleagues in an attempt to enact parts of the act. I introduced a bill similar to the provisions contained in the antiriot amendment. Unfortunately, this bill never became law.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in order to reiterate my concern for the need of such legislation, I have again submitted antiriot legislation for consideration by this body. My bill would make it a criminal offense for any person to travel in interstate commerce or to use the facilities of interstate commerce, including the mail, with the intent to incite, encourage, or carry on a riot or other violent civil disturbance. Included in the bill is a punishment provision of imprisonment for not more than 5 years and/or a fine not to exceed \$10,000.

Such legislation will give law enforcement officials a needed weapon to cope with and hopefully deter interstate build-ups for violence and disturbance. It is an attempt to facilitate, not to undermine, the enforcement of the law by local officials. The bill recognizes that the primary responsibility for the maintenance of law and order within our communities should remain with local officials.